

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Hideyasu Yamabe
Serial No. : 10/699,181 Confirmation No.: 1063
Filing Date : October 31, 2003

REMARKS**Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112**

In the Office Action mailed February 3, 2005, the Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant herein cancels claim 3, and requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Scifres, U.S. Patent No. 4,022,520. Applicant herein cancels claims 1, 3, and 4, and requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scifres, in view of Platzer, as reported in *Popular Science*. Applicant herein cancels claim 2, and requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spigner, in view of Official Notice, and further in view of Platzer, as reported in *Popular Science*. Applicant herein cancels claims 5 and 6, and requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion


Applicant herein cancels claims 1-6 and adds new claims 7-16. Support for these new

claims can be found in the specification, paragraphs [0010], and [0044] to [0091], and in Figures 4 to 16. Support for independent claim 7 can be found in paragraphs [0010], and [0044] to [0054]. These new claims recite the feature that when the door mirror is folded down, the outside mirror surface is caused to turn by the turning mechanism so that what is reflected behind the vehicle's body is reflected thereon. This enables a driver of a vehicle incorporating the door mirror to observe what is behind the vehicle when the vehicle is driven backwards (i.e. in reverse) and the door mirror is folded down. The specification states in paragraph [0010] that the inventive door mirror "... can permit a driver of the vehicle to easily make sure of the safety behind the vehicle's body even when the driver drives the vehicle backward with its door mirror folded down". See also paragraph [0054]. In contrast, none of the prior art cited by the Examiner, nor other prior art known to applicant, discloses or teaches the above mentioned feature that a rear view is reflected on a mirror when the mirror is folded down. Thus applicant respectfully requests that the new claims be allowed.

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is requested. No new matter has been added. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if there are any matters which could be discussed to expedite the prosecution of the above-identified application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 2, 2005


D. Peter Hochberg, Esq.
Reg. No. 24,603

D. PETER HOCHBERG CO., L.P.A.
1940 East 6th Street - 6th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2294
(216) 771-3800
DPH/KRV